



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,904	08/14/2006	Amr Yassin	US020570	6587
24737 7590 03/14/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
PARK, JEONG S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2154				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/14/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/539,904

Applicant(s)

YASSIN ET AL.

Examiner

JEONG S. PARK

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/5/2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/15/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed 05 December 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zweig (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,325 B2), and further in view of Yamada et al. (hereinafter Yamada)(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0081937 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Zweig teaches as follows:

a multi-dimensional robotic web browser (computerized mobile robot with an onboard Internet web server, see, e.g., abstract, lines 1-7), comprising:

means for downloading high level program instructions transmitted over an electronic network (the robot receives its most general highest level commands from the remote Internet link, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 65-67), wherein said high level program instructions include synchronized multimedia integration language (robot control instructions may be written in a wide variety of formats and language such as XML scripts, PERL script, JAVA applets, and the like, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 31-40, wherein the SMIL is similar to an HTML-like language is written in XML, see, e.g., W3C SMIL 1.0 Specification); and

means for rendering said downloaded high level program instructions (control

instructions) transmitted over said electronic network (Internet)(interpreter program, RCS software 16 in figure 2, interprets and compiles various control instructions, see, e.g., col. 10, lines 10-12), such that when at least a portion of said downloaded instructions are rendered (interpret and modify these top-level commands in a quick and real-time manner, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-6), direct said robotic web browser to one of move in three dimensions (a robot may be given a remote command over the Internet to move forward a number of feet, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 7-8).

Zweig does not teach for designing the robot as a web server instead of a web browser.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to alter the functionality of the robot from a web server to a web browser in order to manage a plurality of robotic web browsers with one dedicated web server and also to reduce the cost of making the robot.

Yamada teaches as follows:

direct said robotic web browser to move in three dimensions (movement mechanism, see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0012] and page 2, paragraph [0026]), play back an audio stream (sound data is downloaded with the connection means, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0067], outputting the downloaded sound data as a voice by the vocalization means, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0053]), and play back a video stream (display unit displays information, see, e.g., page 9, paragraph [0219], attached sound file is played, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0314]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to include multi functional robot as taught by Yamada in order to be utilized the robot as an adult toy performing various operations.

Since Yamada teaches a display unit and the capability to run the downloaded sound file, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yamada to include video stream play back function.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Zweig teaches as follows:

means for storing said downloaded high level program instructions (CGI commands are passed through CGI interface to other program in the robot's onboard memory, see, e.g., col. 10, lines 28-36); and

means for retrieving said downloaded high level program instructions (CGI commands) from said storing means (robot's onboard memory)(run these other program passed from CGI commands as needed, see, e.g., col. 10 ,lines 28-36).

Regarding claim 3, Zweig teaches as follows:

means for rendering pre-stored high level program instructions (processed instructions or previously assigned set of commands) pre-stored on one or more computer-readable media (robot's onboard memory) coupled to or integrated with said robotic web browser (standing orders are to modify the state of the robot without requesting further input from remote internet site, the robot activates a previously assigned set of commands to move out of the area, see, e.g., col. 11, lines 30-40).

Regarding claim 4, Zweig teaches as follows:

a mobile robot (functioning as a web server) sends Hyper Text Markup Language files using the HTTP protocol on telecommunications link to a web browser running on remote Internet site (see, e.g., col. 9, lines 36-39); and

a user on web browser sends CGI data to the CGI interface of the robot's onboard web server (see, e.g., col. 9, lines 39-42).

Since Zweig teaches using a robot as a web server instead of web browser, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to alter the functionality of the robot from a web server to a web browser in order to manage a plurality of robotic web browsers with one dedicated web server and also to reduce the cost of making the robot.

Regarding claim 5, Zweig teaches as follows:

means for processing data in two-dimensions (displaying video) in accordance with current and future network browser standards (it is inherent functionality for any existing web browser, Java applets can translate user commands to other languages ,display video, display interactive graphics and other useful functions, see, e.g., col. 2 , lines 43-50).

Regarding claims 6 and 11, Zweig teaches as follows:

said electronic network is the Internet (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 7, Zweig teaches as follows:

said program instructions are downloaded in accordance with a recognized Internet transmission protocol (HTTP and TCP/IP, see, e.g., col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 4).

Regarding claims 8 and 12, Zweig teaches as follows:

said electronic network is one of a wireless or wired network (Internet could be wireless or wired network, see, e.g., see, e.g., col. 6, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 9, Zweig teaches as follows:

a system for executing high level language instructions (highest level commands), downloaded over an electronic network (Internet link)(see, e.g., col. 6, line 65 to col. 7, line 6), said instructions for processing in a multi-dimensional robotic web browser (see, e.g., col. 7, line 7-8), the system comprising:

at least one remote computer (remote Internet user, 4 in figure 1) for generating said high level language instructions (the remote Internet user sends back CGI commands requesting robotic movement back to server, see, e.g., col. 10, lines 50-56);

said electronic network (telecommunications link, 3 in figure 1) coupling said at least one remote computer (remote Internet user, 4 in figure 1) with said multi-dimensional robotic web browser (mobile robot, 1 in figure 1)(see, e.g., col. 9, lines 34-39);

said multi-dimensional robotic web browser (computerized mobile robot with an onboard Internet web server, see, e.g., abstract, lines 1-7), comprising:

means for receiving said high level language instructions downloaded over said electronic network (the robot receives its most general highest level commands from the remote Internet link, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 65-67); and

means for rendering said downloaded high level language instructions (control instructions), such that when at least a portion of said instructions are rendered by said

robotic web browser (interpret and modify these top-level commands in a quick and real-time manner, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-6), direct said robotic web browser to move in three-dimensions (a robot may be given a remote command over the Internet to move forward a number of feet, see, e.g., col. 7, lines 7-8).

Zweig does not teach for designing the robot as a web server instead of a web browser.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to alter the functionality of the robot from a web server to a web browser in order to manage a plurality of robotic web browsers with one dedicated web server and also to reduce the cost of making the robot.

Yamada teaches as follows:

direct said robotic web browser to move in three dimensions (movement mechanism, see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0012] and page 2, paragraph [0026]), play back an audio stream (sound data is downloaded with the connection means, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0067], outputting the downloaded sound data as a voice by the vocalization means, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0053]), and play back a video stream (display unit displays information, see, e.g., page 9, paragraph [0219], attached sound file is played, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0314]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to include multi functional robot as taught by Yamada in order to be utilized the robot as an adult toy performing various operations.

Since Yamada teaches a display unit and the capability to run the downloaded sound file, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yamada to include video stream play back function.

Regarding claims 13-20, Yamada teaches as follows:

the multi-dimensional robotic web browser is configured to blink twice, smile, and bow (the display unit expresses various expressions of the robot with corresponding sound and movement, see, e.g., page 13, paragraph [0264] and page 17, paragraph [0318]);

perform a country dance and shake hands (movement based on music, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0320]-[0321]);

synchronized to move in accordance with a content being rendered (control unit controls the motors based on the operational control information and makes the robot perform operations corresponding to the message, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0314]);

produce behaviors and interactions based on a story line of the content (interpreted as a message)(control unit controls the motors based on the operational control information and makes the robot perform operations corresponding to the message and text data may also be read, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0314]); and

produce behaviors and interactions based on user preferences regarding rendering of data including pace of delivery, loudness of the rendering, and movements (series of movements of the robot by assembling control codes corresponding to the individual operations, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0314] and the robot comprises as

Art Unit: 2154

means for detecting the peripheral situation and inputs, a touch sensor, sound sensor, light sensor and status sensor to correspond for various interactions, see, e.g., page 9, paragraph [0218].

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to include multi functional robot as taught by Yamada in order to be utilized the robot as an adult toy performing various operations.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 05 December 2007, with respect to claim 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

A. Summary of Applicant's Arguments

In the remarks, the applicant argues as follows:

1) Regarding amended claims 1 and 9, wherein said high level program instructions include synchronized multimedia integration language;

2) Regarding amended claims 1 and 9, direct said robotic web browser to move in three dimensions, play back an audio stream and play back a video stream; and

3) New claims 13-20.

B. Response to Arguments

In response to argument 1), Zweig teaches that robot control instructions may be written in a wide variety of formats and language such as XML scripts, PERL script, JAVA applets, and the like (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 31-40), wherein the SMIL is similar to an HTML-like language is written in XML (see, e.g., W3C SMIL 1.0 Specification).

In response to argument 2), Yamada teaches as follows:

direct said robotic web browser to move in three dimensions (movement mechanism, see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0012] and page 2, paragraph [0026]), play back an audio stream (sound data is downloaded with the connection means, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0067], outputting the downloaded sound data as a voice by the vocalization means, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0053]), and play back a video stream (display unit displays information, see, e.g., page 9, paragraph [0219], attached sound file is played, see, e.g., page 17, paragraph [0314]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zweig to include multi functional robot as taught by Yamada in order to be utilized the robot as an adult toy performing various operations.

Since Yamada teaches a display unit and the capability to run the downloaded sound file it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yamada to include video stream play back function.

In response to argument 3), new claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zweig (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,325 B2), and further in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0081937 A1) as explained above.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JP

February 29, 2008

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154

